

## THE LAND QUESTION.

The Editor of "The Friend of Man," is not satisfied with our answer to his query in relation to the distribution of Public Lands, and thinks that we might have replied in an article but little longer than the one in which we gave our reasons for declining so to do. It is true we might have said yes or no, or yes and no, as we told him the editors differed with each other on this subject. Many questions might be asked, to which we could reply in a single line, but rather than do so, rather than connect, or seem to connect any extraneous topics with the Anti-Slavery question, we would prefer giving in an article of twenty lines, our reasons for not replying. We do not feel bound to answer every question proposed, although the propounder may think it intimately connected with the system of slavery—if we do not, that is sufficient reason why we should decline discussing it in an Anti-Slavery paper. We have heard some contend, and with much plausibility, that if we convert the slaveholders to Grahamism slavery would soon cease, but that is no reason—so long as we think otherwise why our editorial columns should be occupied with disquisitions on Dietetics.

Others contend, both opposers and approvers of the system, that the Bible is the foundation of Am. Slavery; we think otherwise, and therefore do not enter into the merits of this question. Friend Hinckman seems to think that the Land Monopoly, is the principle upon which it rests, (although, we do not see, by the way, that the mere question as to whether actual settlers should possess the Public Lands has any direct bearing on the principle of Land Monopoly) if so, we do not concur with him, and cannot pursue the same course, which he must feel it his duty to pursue, for each and all must act in conformity with their perceptions of truth, of duty, of right and wrong, of cause and effect.

His remark that our excuse "comes with rather an ill-grace from a paper that has had the independence (he it said to its credit,) to speak out on so many and various occasions, against the corruptions of the American clergy and churches, and other popular institutions of the day" is inappropriate, and the compliment the sentence contains altogether misplaced; at least, we were not aware that we had spoken against the corruptions of the Am. church and clergy in other particulars than their pro-slavery position, unless perchance by way of illustration, or by way of confirming what was said in regard to slavery.

If the Land Monopoly were wrong, and the recognition of every man's equal right to the soil would abolish slavery, still this would not be the first question to discuss, but one of secondary consideration.

If the Bible doctrine of Non-Resistance be true, and the abrogation of physical violence as applied to man would destroy slavery, still this question lies back of another which must be previously discussed.

We will briefly state our reasons for adopting these positions, which may appear inconsistent to some. No man regards his horse as equally entitled with himself to a share of God's earth, at least we never heard an Anti-Land Monopolist contend for such doctrine, and in our intercourse with Non-Resistants we have never met with one who did not deem it perfectly right to use such physical force as was needed to compel submission from the animals over which he chose to exercise dominion. The slave of the South sustains the same relation to his master as the horse, and other animals to the Anti-Land Monopolist and Non-Resistant; he is "one who is in the power of his master to whom he belongs,"—"a chattel personal to all intents, purposes, and constructions whatsoever," consequently we cannot establish the slave's right to land, until his right to himself is recognized—he cannot be exempted from physical violence, until he is clothed with humanity, even though Non-Resistance should prevail. We cannot see then that the case of the slave would be reached by a discussion of either of these questions, until his humanity, and his inalienable right to liberty are established. Some of our Non-Resistant friends, and opponents of Land Monopoly, overlook these facts, and see the subject in a different light from that in which we regard it. This will account for the following resolutions which were adopted at what the editor of "The Friend of Man," calls an anti-slavery meeting.

**Resolved,** That we believe Slavery is not confined exclusively to the Southern portion of this Union, but that it is a part of the system of every government of the world.

**Resolved,** That to successfully abolish all systems of Slavery, it is necessary to abolish the present system of Government LAND MONOPOLY, for mankind can never be free while he has task permission of a lordly Land Aristocrat to work for bread to keep himself and family from starving.

**Resolved,** That universal liberty consists in the undoing of all unequal burdens—the abandonment of all tyranny and oppression, and not the mere abolishment of Southern Negro Slavery.

We feel it our duty at the present time to discuss the question of chattelism; and when we see the slave within the pale of a common brotherhood, that will be a proper time to contend for other rights which are based upon his right to himself.

## TEXAS.

The Resolutions declaring Texas to be one of the United States, were before the House of Representatives for discussion, or adoption rather, on the 16th inst. A motion to lay them on the table was negatived by a vote of 142 to 52. The previous question having been moved and carried, the question was taken on their engrossment and third reading.—Yeas 141; nays 52. The question then recurring to the passage of the resolutions, the correspondent of the Tribune says,

"Mr. Rockwell of Massachusetts proceeded in a very able and eloquent speech, pointing out the objections to the resolutions. The conclusion of his speech was very fine. His vindication of Massachusetts and his tribute to John Quincy Adams were beautiful and powerful. He showed that the Constitution of Texas now before the House was in direct violation of the Joint Resolution for the Annexation of Texas.

The Annexation Resolutions provided that in a certain part of Texas, Slavery should not be permitted. The Constitution of the State of Texas guaranteed Slavery in the whole of Texas. He concluded by moving that the Constitution of Texas be re-committed to the Committee on Territories, with instructions to introduce a proviso that Slavery, except for crime, be excluded from the new State.

Here a scene of confusion which is totally undescribable followed. The majority refused to let any one proceed. They vigorously applied the gag. On the same decision they voted to sustain the Chair by 92 to 77, and immediately afterwards voted not to sustain by a vote of 92 to 93. The Yeas and Nays were called for on the final passage of the Resolutions, and resulted in, Yeas 141, Nays 56.

An attempt was made to bring them before the Senate on the 18th, but failed, as it required the unanimous consent of the members to introduce them at that time, which was not given. When they do come up, there is no question but the Senatorial vote will tell for Slavery and Texas.

Several communications have been crowded out this week, and much other matter which we desired to insert. Our sheet is not large enough for our wants.

## SIGNIFICANT.

Some of our friends in Eastern Pa. became tired of laboring in the A. S. Society—it was a heavy, up-hill kind of business, and it only for stalwart souls in which faith and hope are strong, and so they organized a political party—a Liberty party as they called it. A much less odious name is Liberty in the ears of American Democrats, than that harsh, grating compound, anti-slavery. They proposed voting slavery down, and some in league with them were so rash as to avow that if voting did not do it, they would pull off the political sleuth and present the naked bayonet. We judge however from a recent advertisement in the American Citizen under the head of "Christmas Fair," that their adopted name has not answered their expectations, so they have hunted up the old discarded title to use as a prefix, and inform the world that said Fair is for the benefit of the "Anti-Slavery Liberty Party."

## THE PRESS IN GERMANY.

To show the sort of "Liberty of the press" enjoyed in Berlin, it is stated in a recent French paper, that a celebrated advocate, a man of profound legal learning and spotless reputation, has been condemned to four months imprisonment and a fine of four hundred thalers, for the crime and misdemeanor of writing an article in a periodical work, recommending the opening of the Courts, and the public administration of justice! But there is another case which really outstrips it.—A newspaper, with a circulation of 5000, producing a large income to its proprietors, has been suppressed by the government, on the ground that its writers gave the censors too much trouble in correcting their articles!—*Philadelphia Pennsylvanian.*

## THE PRESS IN AMERICA.

To show the sort of "Liberty of the press" enjoyed in America, it is stated upon good authority, that a celebrated editor, a man of clear moral perception and spotless reputation, was condemned to pay a fine of one hundred dollars and suffer imprisonment in Baltimore jail until the samewas paid, for the crime and misdemeanor of writing articles in a periodical work, recommending the breaking of the bondman's fetters, and the strict administration of justice! But there is another case which really outstrips it. A newspaper, with a circulation of nearly 4000, established at a heavy expense to its proprietors, was suppressed by mobocratic power, on the ground that its writers gave the mobocrats too much uneasiness in making their practices public, and it was too much trouble for them to correct their villainous deeds.—Though government did not directly engage in this act, yet it stood by as a consenting witness!

When other facts are stated in regard to the German Press, we will furnish a parallel to each from the history of the Press in America.

## For the Anti-Slavery Bugle. OHIO LEGISLATURE.

**Monday Dec. 15th.**—In the SENATE, the usual variety of petitions was presented, some for the erection of new counties and some against it; one from the citizens of Richland Co. for the promotion of Agriculture; one from 286 citizens of Medina Co. for an act suppressing houses of ill fame, and more adequately to punish the crime of seduction; one from 318 citizens of Geauga Co. for a law to punish more effectually seduction and other crimes. Committee on Judiciary reported that it would be unconstitutional to pass a law rendering Ministers of the Gospel ineligible to elective civil offices, as had been asked for in the memorial of the Rev. George Dennison—the Committee was discharged from a further consideration of the subject.—Same Committee reported adversely to creating the office of Attorney General, and abolishing that of Prosecuting Attorney. Several other reports were made by that and other Standing and Select Committees.

Petitions were presented in the House, on the all engrossing subject of new counties; one for the creation of a State Board of Agriculture; one for an improvement in the Common School Laws; and one from 50 women of Ashtabula Co. asking for an amendment of the law so as to exempt the real and personal property of females, from execution on debts of their husbands, and to give to females the entire control of their property; all of which were appropriately referred.

The following preamble and resolutions were read and laid on the table.

**Whereas,** the practice of corporal punishment is inflicted on American citizens employed in the service of the army and navy of the United States, and in some instances, it is feared, such punishment is inflicted to gratify the malice of some officers whose displeasure they have incurred, therefore

**Resolved,** by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, that our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested, to use their endeavors to so alter the law regulating the army and navy which authorizes a practice so repugnant to humanity, civilization and republicanism.

**Resolved,** that the Governor be requested to forward a copy of the above preamble and resolutions, to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

The Committee on Finance made the following report.

**Resolved,** by the Senate and House of Representatives, That it is expedient to provide by law for valuation at its true value in money, of such real property in the State, as shall not be expressly exempted therefrom, to be reported to the Governor on or before the 15th day of November next, for levying a tax upon part of the property in the State which is exempt from taxation under existing laws, and for a more effective administration of the laws now in force, for levying taxes, according to their true intent and meaning.

Mr. REMMEL moved to amend by adding the following resolutions, remarking that he did not suppose they would be accepted:

**Resolved,** That it would be inexpedient and unjust, to increase in any wise, the taxes resting upon real estate.

**Resolved,** That those portions of the tax laws, passed at the last session of the Legislature, which tax labor, and compel our merchants and manufacturers to give under oath, an exposure of their private affairs, should be repealed, and provisions substituted, which, by a proper selection of assessors for the different branches of commerce, will subject for all useful purposes of fair and equal taxation, the capital of our merchants and manufacturers to its just share of the public burdens, and that the other provisions of said law be thoroughly revised, so as to make them operate with more equality.

**Resolved,** That the capital of banks, public and private, should be placed upon the tax duplicate in each county where they are located, and that the amount of taxes thus received into the State Treasury, should be specially set apart and applied towards the payment of the funded debt of the State.

**Resolved,** That an income tax should be levied upon the income of Attorneys at Law, upon Physicians and upon the Salaries of the officers of Corporations, equal, at least, to 5 per cent, upon the amount of income or salary, over and above the sum of \$200 per annum.

**December 16th.**—In the SENATE petitions were presented for the abolition of capital punishment; for the promotion of agriculture; for the protection of the property of married women, for preserving the inviolability of burying grounds, for a repeal of the Black Laws &c., &c., which were appropriately referred. The Committee on Common Schools, to whom was referred the memorial of L. A. Hine, praying a repeal of all laws on the subject of Common Schools, reported that, in the opinion of the committee, the granting of the prayer of the petitioner would be inexpedient.

The following resolution was agreed to:

**Resolved,** That the standing committee on Common Schools and School Lands be instructed to inquire into the expediency of so amending the law for the support and better regulation of Common Schools now in force, as to prohibit Directors from employing any person as a teacher in said district, without first obtaining the consent of a majority of the householders in said district; and in all cases where a teacher shall be employed, it shall be the duty of the Directors for the time being, to give notice to each householder in said district, that such person has been employed, and the time when such school will be commenced.

After the reception and reference of petitions, the House went into a Committee of the Whole for the consideration of several Bills, among which was one from the Senate for the more effectual protection of property against mob violence. The Ohio State Journal gives the following report of what transpired on that occasion.

Mr. Gallagher said, upon consideration, he thought there was no necessity for the passage of this bill. Property was protected under the common law; and damages had been recovered under it.

Mr. Drake said he thought the gentleman from Hamilton mistaken in the statement,

that damages could be recovered under the common law. In Maryland, decisions had been made, which he presumed were referred to by the gentleman; but Maryland had a statute law on the subject. Without committing himself for this bill, he must say he was in favor of some law of the kind.

Mr. Flinn objected to the principle of the bill. It was making cities and towns insurers against calamities of the kind referred to. With equally as much propriety, should we make them insurers against fire and the lightning. It inflicted punishment upon the innocent, for evils which they could not prevent. It was an invitation to men to provoke popular violence. He would go as far as the farthest in strengthening the police, but he was opposed to the adoption of laws recognizing this principle.

Mr. Irwin took opposite grounds from the gentleman last up.

This bill made all citizens of towns and cities directly interested in the preservation of order. It appealed to their interest to lend efficient aid to the authorities in suppressing disturbances and riots. Since a similar law was passed in Maryland, we have heard of no disturbances and riots in Baltimore. The effect had been most salutary.

Mr. Flinn moved to amend by making towns and cities responsible for damages by fire, earthquake and whirlwind—lost.

Mr. Flinn said the Legislature had no power to pass such a law. It was iniquitous legislation which caused the outbursts of popular violence, in nine cases out of ten. The riots in Cincinnati, induced by the corrupt practices of banks, had a better effect in regulating the currency, than all the legislation on that subject. The remedy for these outbreaks was to correct our corrupt legislation.

Mr. Johnson did not know but he should move to amend the bill, by excluding Cincinnati from its operation. He was also inclined to introduce a bill, to repeal all laws so far as they relate to that city. This thing of being restrained by law was "unconstitutional" clearly, besides being unpleasant. The gentleman thought this bill would tax the innocent. On the same principle the expense of the establishment of jails and the support of the police and criminal courts, was taxing, or as the gentleman would say, "penalizing" the innocent.

Mr. OLDS moved to amend by excepting Banks and Banking institutions from the protection of the law—lost.

Mr. Mason thought the bill sufficiently guarded. The principle upon which it was founded was that of prevention. If the bill passed he believed mobs would not be frequent in our history.

Mr. OLDS moved to amend the bill by applying its provisions to organized townships.

Mr. DRAKE said the principle involved was not that of insurance. We proceeded on the principle that the citizens of cities and towns could prevent the destruction of property by mobs. This was a new move in our legislation, and we should apply the laws to the great evil first. If it operated well we might extend it. He went still further. He would strike out that portion which made the recovery of damages depend upon the conduct of the persons aggrieved. We should not set up the mob to judge whether the conduct of individuals was proper or improper. On the same principle the populace might punish the horse thief and hang the murderer.

Mr. REMMEL contended that the principle recognized in this bill, would require us to remunerate all sufferers from crime of every description.

[Mr. DRAKE remarked that the principle should be recognized, if the gentleman could suppose a case in which the public could prevent the crime.]

Mr. R. continued. He thought the law might have the effect of calling out citizens, when they suspected the rising of a mob, in order to prevent it, but it would be impossible to collect damages, under the loose provision of the law.

Several other members spoke on the subject.

Mr. FLINN moved to amend by excepting Cincinnati—lost.

Mr. GALLAGHER moved to amend so as to provide, that if any person be killed during riot, the Mayor and Common Council shall be hanged—lost.

On motion of Mr. MOULTON the committee rose, and the bill was referred to the committee on the Judiciary, with instructions (proposed by Mr. Remmel) to inquire into the expediency of providing that no Court of the State shall entertain any suit against any city &c., unless it shall be proven that the owner of the property destroyed, had used all diligence in obtaining legal redress of the persons composing the riot.

**December 17th.**—Petitions were presented in the SENATE, asking for a law for the promotion of Agriculture, in which subject the people appear to be much interested if we may judge by the number of petitions they send to the Senate and House; included in the same petition was a request that a State Board of Agriculture be established, and the formation of County Societies encouraged.

One asking for the passage of a law to more effectually protect religious societies from disturbance was read and referred, and the usual number and varieties of petitions which we have heretofore noted were presented and referred, after which came the usual uninteresting reports from Standing and Select Committees. A motion was made and lost, that the Senate adjourn for the purpose of allowing its members to attend the Temperance Convention.

In the House, Bills of incorporation for a Chapel, and an Insurance company were passed, then followed the usual deluge of petitions to tax dogs, build new counties, repeal the Black Laws, regulate the License system, prevent horse racing, &c. were read, and appropriately referred. A petition from Ashtabula Co. asked for the amendment of the Resurrection Laws, making exhumation a penitentiary offence. One from the Ohio Yearly Meeting of Friends asked for the repeal of the Black Laws. A petition was presented, (10 ft. in length) from 500 citizens of Montgomery county, for a law empowering the legal voters of every ward and

township in the state, to prohibit the retail of ardent spirits. A memorial from the Ohio and Indiana Society of Friends asking for a repeal of the Black Laws was presented by the Speaker.

Mr. BELL moved it be not received on the ground, upon which a similar petition was refused last year, viz: that it was from other than citizens of the State.

Mr. FLINN explained, that the society from which the petition emanated, was composed of citizens of Ohio, as well as Indiana, and that these societies uniformly acted as a society, in their yearly meetings.

After some conversation, the petition was received by a vote of 19 to 20.

We find the following in the State Journal; the resolution was introduced by Mr. Gallagher.

**Whereas,** The employment of convicts, in the Ohio Penitentiary at various branches of mechanical labor, has seriously affected the interests of a large portion of the citizens of Ohio, engaged in mechanical pursuits, by giving to the State Government a monopoly of all the branches of mechanical industry, in which the convicts in said Penitentiary are employed, as also, tending to degrade the mechanic arts, working great wrong to the productive laborer; that portion of our citizens to whom more than to any other, our State is indebted for its past prosperity and present wealth and greatness; it being no sufficient argument in support of the Penitentiary system of labor, that it results in immediate pecuniary benefit to the State; for admitting the fact, it cannot also, be denied that its effect upon the mechanics of the State is unjust and unequal, and in this, directly antagonistic to the right spirit of republicanism; in view of these facts, and with the desire and intention that the tax and burden of government shall fall alike upon all the citizens of Ohio, and that the honor and dignity of labor, may not be sullied or affected by a forced and legalized connexion with crime, therefore be it

**Resolved,** That the committee on the Penitentiary be instructed to inquire into the expediency of reporting a bill, at as early a day as possible, abolishing the system of labor and contracting, now pursued under the rules and laws regulating the Ohio Penitentiary, having at the same time, care to violate no previous contract, nor in any way to interfere with individual rights.

Mr. GALLAGHER supported his resolution at length.

Mr. SUMMERS said he was ready to meet this question at once, by a direct vote. He could not understand the propriety or justice of the proposition of the gentleman from Hamilton. If he had a correct understanding of the matter, it amounted to this, that the convicts should be left without labor, and as a consequence, that instead of an income of \$20,000 to ease us, in a small degree, of the burdens of taxation, we shall be compelled to pay some \$50,000 more to support these convicts. Now four fifths of the burthen of the taxes of the State are paid by the agricultural class, and a small proportion only by the mechanics. Shall we levy this additional burthen on the already burthened agriculturist? Standing here a farmer himself, and representing a large farming district, he could not consent. The gentleman from H. assumes that convict labor degrades free labor. Wise legislators in all the other States, and in this State, have taken a different view of this subject. It has always been thought proper to employ convicts at hard labor. He had never felt it dishonorable to labor,—and did not believe others have felt so, for the reason that labor is still considered honorable in our State, although convicts have been engaged in that business. Would it disgrace the farmer if convicts were made to raise their own bread? The gentleman threatens us with a continual agitation of this question. He may possibly learn, that after this House has passed directly on this question, it may be prudent if not wise, to let the motion rest, till this hall is filled with wiser men than the present occupants. Very little would be gained probably, by a repetition of the subject, should it not succeed at the present time.

Mr. RINGWAY replied with much force to the remarks of the gentleman from Hamilton county. He said that he was a practical mechanic himself, and probably felt as much for their honor, as did the professional gentleman from Hamilton county, but never felt degraded because convicts worked at the same business. He took a survey of the progress made in this State to prevent injurious competition. He showed that the mechanics did not object to convicts being employed on public work, for the erection of public buildings, and that all was done, and on progress that the mechanics had a right to expect at the present time. He adverted to the operation of the Pennsylvania law, that of solitary confinement. He pointed out the fact, that if all these branches were excluded our State would be flooded from other States; from the labor of convicts, and inferred, that it would be equally degrading to the mechanic and impolitic for the State. He alluded also to the subject of saddlery and hardware, which was very properly carried on and did not interfere with the business of others. He mentioned the manufacture of locks and door latches not made of malable iron, how our shops were filled by such articles manufactured in the State of Connecticut. He took a survey of certain establishments in Cincinnati and the unjust competition attempted some years since by the Directors of the State Prison against that experiment at Cincinnati.

But the gentleman from Hamilton put his wish of change in the law, on the disgrace that attached to the free mechanic, hence his own remarks beyond that point were not absolutely necessary, and as had already been shown, that this gentleman's arguments go against his own position.

Mr. FERGUSON followed, taking the ground that this resolution demanded and should receive full attention. He advocated its reference to the appropriate committee, for consideration.

We learn that Cassius M. Clay designs visiting Cuba in order to recruit his health, which is much impaired.